

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-38 were originally submitted.

Claims 1, 9, 15, and 21 were previously amended.

Claims 1-38 remain in this application.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-23, 25, 26, 28, 29, and 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,430,576 to Gates et al (Gates). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Gates discloses that in the conventional systems, to control and execute certain applications, information etc. an object is used, where the object refers to an entity that contains data and the associated functions that can use or affect that data. The object is implemented through an object oriented programming. A request is sent to the object to execute the functions.

Gates describes a method and an apparatus to synchronize the object that is copied from a remote location to a local space at a client to match the running applications. The required synchronization can be with respect to time, type of request to be executed or the number of requests to be processed. Gates further describes a policy that specifies the conditions for synchronizing the object. The policy can be a default policy or based upon the user action. The rule set of the policy can also be determined by analyzing the requests exchanged between the server and the client. The synchronization of the copy of the object located at the client side with the copy of the object present at the remote location is carried out,

1 where the synchronization is performed by transmitting minimal information about
2 any change in the local copy of the object from the client side to a remote system
3 such as server. The function of transmitting the minimal information is managed
4 by the editing context. Consequently, the updates in the copies of the object
5 present at other remote locations are made by the server.

6 The object can also have a private data with access limited to a particular
7 client. Therefore, only the non-confidential information is passed while creating
8 the object for the client having limited or no access to the private data. The object
9 can also be retrieved from the server for creating the required copy of the object at
10 the client side by using certain segments of the object that have not been
11 previously used. This method of object creation is called as faulting. The segment
12 can contain the reference to other objects at some remote location from which the
13 data is needed to be retrieved. For retrieval of objects, the method uses an object
14 graph editing context. The object graph provides a list of objects that accessible
15 by a particular client. The editing context helps in getting only the required data
16 and not the whole of information contained in the referenced object. The editing
17 context at the client is called as object store. The required data included in the
18 referenced object is acquired only when it is absent from the local space at the
19 client. The editing context is also used to manage the local object graph. To
20 access the remote or referenced objects, a object persistent mechanism is used. In
21 this mechanism, an object store sends a request to the server editing context. The
22 server editing context provides for the connection to the external facility such as a
23 relational database or a file system where the object is actually persistent or
24 present.

1 **Independent claim 1**, for example, recites “[a] method comprising:

2 generating a policy digest for a cached policy that applies to a client,
3 the policy digest identifying at least one assertion the client is complying
4 with; and

5 including the policy digest in a request by the client to access a
6 resource.

7 Gates does not disclose the element “generating a policy digest for a cached
8 policy that applies to a client” as recited by claim 1. In contrast, Gates discloses
9 distribution and synchronization of copies of objects locally. The policy
10 responsible for synchronization of objects is based upon specific conditions such
11 as time, processing of the type of messages, processing of the number of messages,
12 etc. The conditions or rules for the policy are determined by evaluating the
13 messages exchanged between the local object and the remote object. See Gates,
14 Abstract; col. 1, lines 21-25 and 62-66; col. 3, lines 56-66; and col. 6, lines 36-44
15 and 61-67.

16 For example, the Application describes generating a policy digest for a
17 cached policy that applies to a client. A client messaging module is configured to
18 generate the policy digest. The policy digest includes the assertions (e.g., rules and
19 declarations) which govern access to the resources and policy identity which
20 identifies the cached policy used to communicate with the host (i.e., server). The
21 cached policy is applied through the policy digest with the help of associated
22 assertions and the policy identity. The policy digest checks for the validity of the
23 policy when the policy digest in a request message is transmitted from the client to
24 the server to access a resource at the server.
25

1 Accordingly, Gates fails to disclose or show each recited element of claim
2 1, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102
3 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

4 Dependent claims 3, 4, 6-8 depend on claim 1, and are allowable at the least
5 by virtue of their dependency on base claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant
6 respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 3, 4, 6-8 be withdrawn based
7 on the reasons provided in support of claim 1. Furthermore, particular dependent
8 claims are allowable based on additional reasons provided below.

9 Claim 3 further recites “[t]he method of claim 1, wherein generating the
10 policy digest includes encoding a bit vector identifying selected assertions from the
11 cached policy.” Gates does not disclose or show the element of :generating a
12 policy digest includes encoding a bit vector identifying selected assertions from the
13 cached policy” as recited by claim 3. Gates discloses that the synchronization of
14 the object that is copied from a remote location to a local space at a client to match
15 the running applications. The required synchronization can be with respect to
16 time, type of request to be executed or the number of requests to be processed.
17 Gates describes a policy that specifies the conditions for synchronizing the object.
18 The policy can be a default policy or based upon the user action. The rule set of
19 the policy can also be determined by analyzing the requests exchanged between the
20 server and the client. The synchronization of the copy of the object located at the
21 client side with the copy of the object present at the remote location is carried out.
22 This synchronization is performed by transmitting minimal information about any
23 change in the local copy of the object from the client side to a remote system such
24 as server. The function of transmitting the minimal information is managed by the
25 editing context. Consequently, the updates in the copies of the object present at

1 other remote locations are made by the server. The object can also have a private
2 data with access limited to a particular client. Hence, only the non-confidential
3 information is passed while creating the object for the client having limited or no
4 access to the private data. See Gates, col. 6, lines 36-60, col. 7, lines 50-61.

5 For example, the Application discloses generating a policy digest includes
6 encoding a bit vector identifying selected assertions from the cached policy. The
7 bit vector written in XML in the cached policy is encoded with the policy digest.
8 The binary value of the bit vector is encoded as a text value indicating the
9 assertion selected in the policy digest. The bit value 1 indicates selection of a
10 particular assertion and the bit value 0 refers to the non-selection of the particular
11 assertion. In contrast, Gates discloses that the object is mutated or transformed
12 into a different kind of object containing only some specific information which is
13 allowed to be accessible by the client. See Gates, col. 7, lines 50-57.

14 Claim 6 further recites “[t]he method of claim 1, further comprising:
15 incrementing a counter each time the cached policy is used; and removing the
16 cached policy from a cache at the client when the counter exceeds a limit value.”

17 Gates does not disclose or show the element “incrementing a counter each
18 time the cached policy is used; and removing the cached policy from a cache at the
19 client when the counter exceeds a limit value” as recited by claim 6. Gates
20 discloses the synchronization of the object that is copied from a remote location to
21 a local space at a client to match the running applications. The required
22 synchronization can be with respect to time, type of request to be executed or the
23 number of requests to be processed. Gates describes a policy that specifies the
24 conditions for synchronizing the object. The policy can be a default policy or
25 based upon the user action. The rule set of the policy can also be determined by

1 analyzing the requests exchanged between the server and the client. The
2 synchronization of the copy of the object located at the client side with the copy of
3 the object present at the remote location is carried out. This synchronization is
4 performed by transmitting minimal information about any change in the local copy
5 of the object from the client side to a remote system such as server. The function
6 of transmitting the minimal information is managed by the editing context.
7 Consequently, the updates in the copies of the object present at other remote
8 locations are made by the server. See Gates, col. 6, lines 36-60.

9 For example, the Application discloses a counter which is associated with
10 the cached policy. The value of the counter is updated when the cached policy
11 located at the client side is used for comparison with the policy located at the
12 server. When the policy at the client side does not match with the policy that is
13 located at the server, then the value of the counter is incremented. The policy at
14 the client side is also removed, when the value of the counter exceeds a limiting
15 value.

16 Claim 7 further recites “[t]he method of claim 1, further comprising:
17 incrementing a counter for the cached policy when a fault is received at the client
18 in response to using the cached policy; and removing the cached policy from a
19 cache at the client when the counter exceeds a limit value.”

20 Gates does not disclose or show the element “incrementing a counter for the
21 cached policy when a fault is received at the client in response to using the cached
22 policy; and removing the cached policy from a cache at the client when the counter
23 exceeds a limit value” as recited by claim 7.

24 Gates discloses the synchronization of the object that is copied from a
25 remote location to a local space at a client to match the running applications. The

1 required synchronization can be with respect to time, type of request to be
2 executed or the number of requests to be processed. Gates describes a policy that
3 specifies the conditions for synchronizing the object. The rule set of the policy can
4 also be determined by analyzing the requests exchanged between the server and the
5 client. The object can also be retrieved from the server for creating the required
6 copy of the object at the client side by using certain segments of the object that
7 have not been previously used. The method of object creation is known as
8 faulting. The segment can contain the reference to other objects at some remote
9 location from which the data is needed to be retrieved. For retrieval of objects, the
10 object graph editing context helps in getting only the required data and not the
11 whole of information contained in the referenced object. The required data
12 included in the referenced object is acquired only when it is absent from the local
13 space at the client. See Gates, col. 6, lines 36-60 and col. 9, lines 32-48.

14 For example, the Application discloses incrementing a counter for the
15 cached policy when a fault is received at the client in response to using the cached
16 policy; and removing the cached policy from a cache at the client when the counter
17 exceeds a limit value. The value of the counter is incremented when a fault is
18 received from the server. The fault is received when the policy located at the
19 client side does not match with the policy that is located at the server. The policy
20 at the client side is removed when the value of the counter due to faults exceeds a
21 limiting value.

22 Claim 8 further recites “[t]he method of claim 1, further comprising logging
23 a diagnostic event when a fault is received at the client to identify a system
24 problem.”
25

1 Gates does not disclose or show the element “logging a diagnostic event
2 when a fault is received at the client to identify a system problem” as recited by
3 claim 8. Gates discloses that the object can be retrieved from the server for
4 creating the required copy of the object at the client side by using certain segments
5 of the object that have not been previously used. The method of object creation is
6 known as faulting. The segments contain reference to other objects at some
7 remote location from which the data is required to be retrieved. For retrieval of
8 objects, the object graph editing context is used that helps in getting only the
9 required data and not the whole of information contained in the referenced object.
10 The editing context at the client is called as object store. The required data
11 included in the referenced object is acquired only when it is absent from the local
12 space at the client. The editing context is also used to manage the local object
13 graph. To access the remote or referenced objects, a object persistent mechanism
14 is used. In this mechanism, an object store sends a request to the server editing
15 context. The server editing context provides for the connection to the external
16 facility such as a relational database or a file system where the object is actually
17 persistent or present. See Gates, col. 9, lines 49-67.

18 For example, the Application discloses logging of a diagnostic event when a
19 fault is received at the client to identify a system problem. The fault triggers a
20 diagnostic event at the client which identifies the problem with the system and
21 maintains a log for administrator's review.

22 **Independent claim 9** recites the element “extracting at a host a policy
23 digest identifying a cached policy that applies to a client, the policy digest included
24 in a request to access a resource”.

1 As discussed above in support of claim 1, Gates discloses distribution and
2 synchronization of copies of objects locally. The policy responsible for
3 synchronization of objects is based upon specific conditions such as time,
4 processing of the type of messages, processing of the number of messages, etc.
5 The conditions or rules for the policy are determined by evaluating the messages
6 exchanged between the local object and the remote object. See Gates, Abstract;
7 col. 1, lines 21-25 and 62-66; col. 3, lines 56-66; and col. 6, lines 36-44 and 61-67.

8 Accordingly, Gates fails to disclose or show each recited element of claim
9 9, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102
10 rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

11 Dependent claims 10-13 depend on claim 9, and are allowable at the least
12 by virtue of their dependency on base claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant
13 respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 10-13 be withdrawn based on
14 the reasons provided in support of claim 9. Furthermore, particular dependent
15 claims are allowable based on additional reasons provided below.

16 Claim 12 further recites “[t]he method of claim 9, further comprising
17 decoding a bit vector of the cached policy.”

18 Gates does not disclose or show the element “decoding a bit vector of the
19 cached policy” as recited by claim 12. Gates discloses the synchronization of the
20 copy of the object located at the client side with the copy of the object present at
21 the remote location. This is performed by transmitting minimal information about
22 any change in the local copy of the object from the client side to a remote system
23 such as server. Therefore, the updates in the copies of the object present at other
24 remote locations are made by the server. See Gates, col. 6, lines 61-67, col. 7,
25 lines 15-24.

1 For example, the Application discloses decoding of a bit vector that
2 corresponds to a particular assertion mentioned in the policy; however Gates
3 discloses that the object is mutated or transformed into a different kind of object
4 containing only some specific information which is allowed to be accessible by the
5 client. See Gates, col. 7, lines 50-57.

6 **Independent claim 15** recites the element “a policy digest identifying at
7 least one cached policy that applies to a client”. Applicant presents arguments
8 presented in support of claim 1, in support of claim 15.

9 Accordingly, Gates fails to disclose or show each recited element of claim
10 15, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102
11 rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

12 Dependent claims 16-18 and 20 depend on claim 15, and are allowable at
13 the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 15. Accordingly, Applicant
14 respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 16-18 and 20 be withdrawn
15 based on the reasons provided in support of claim 15. Furthermore, particular
16 dependent claims are allowable based on additional reasons provided below.

17 Claim 18 further recites “[t]he system of claim 15, wherein the policy digest
18 is a bit vector of a cached policy.”

19 Gates does not disclose or show “the policy digest is a bit vector of a
20 cached policy” as recited in claim 18. Gates discloses the synchronization of the
21 object that is copied from a remote location to a local space at a client to match the
22 running applications. The required synchronization can be with respect to time,
23 type of request to be executed or the number of requests to be processed. Gates
24 describes a policy that specifies the conditions for synchronizing the object. The
25 policy can be a default policy or based upon the user action. The rule set of the

1 policy can also be determined by analyzing the requests exchanged between the
2 server and the client. The synchronization of the local copy of the object (client
3 side) with the copy present at the remote location (server side) is performed by
4 transmitting minimal information about any change in the local copy of the object
5 from the client side to a remote system such as server. The function of
6 transmitting the minimal information is managed by the editing context. Further,
7 the updates in the copies of the object present at other remote locations are
8 performed by the server. The object can also have a private data with access
9 limited to a particular client. Therefore, only the non-confidential information is
10 passed while creating the object for the client having limited or no access to the
11 private data. See Gates, col. 6, lines 36-60, col. 7, lines 50-61.

12 For example, the Application discloses that the policy digest is a bit vector
13 for a cached policy. The bit vector can have a binary value, either 1 or 0. The bit
14 vector is encoded as a text value indicating the assertion selected in the policy
15 digest. The bit value 1 indicates the selection of a particular assertion and the bit
16 value 0 refers to the non-selection of the particular assertion. However, Gates
17 discloses that the object mutation or transformation into a different kind of object
18 containing only some specific information which is allowed to be accessible by the
19 client. The rule set of the policy can also be determined by analyzing the requests
20 exchanged between the server and the client.

21 **Independent claim 21**, recites “[a] system comprising:

22 a policy digest for a cached policy that applies to a client, the policy
23 digest identifying at least one assertion the client is complying with; and

24 a messaging module including the policy digest in a request by the
25 client to access a resource.

1 Gates does not disclose or show the element “a policy digest for a cached
2 policy that applies to a client, the policy digest identifying at least one assertion the
3 client is complying with” as recited by claim 21. Gates discloses distribution and
4 synchronization of copies of objects locally. The policy responsible for
5 synchronization of objects is based upon specific conditions such as time,
6 processing of the type of messages, processing of the number of messages, etc.
7 The conditions or rules for the policy are determined by evaluating the messages
8 exchanged between the local object and the remote object. See Gates, Abstract;
9 col. 1, lines 21-25 and 62-66; col. 3, lines 56-66; col. 6, lines 36-44 and 61-67.

10 For example, the Application discloses a policy digest for a cached policy
11 that applies to a client, the policy digest identifying at least one assertion the client
12 is complying with. The client messaging module is configured to generate the
13 policy digest. The policy digest includes the assertions (e.g., rules and
14 declarations) which govern access to the resources and policy identity which
15 identifies the cached policy used to communicate with the host (i.e., server). The
16 cached policy is applied through the policy digest with the help of associated
17 assertions and the policy identity. The basic purpose of the policy digest is to
18 check for the validity of the policy, when the policy digest in a request message is
19 transmitted from the client to the server to access a resource at the server.

20 Accordingly, Gates fails to disclose or show each recited element of claim
21 21, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102
22 rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

23 Dependent claims 22, 23 and 25 depend on claim 21, and are allowable at
24 the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 21. Accordingly, Applicant
25 respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 22, 23 and 25 be withdrawn

1 based on the reasons provided in support of claim 21. Furthermore, particular
2 dependent claims are allowable based on additional reasons provided below.

3 Claim 23 further recites “[t]he system of claim 21, wherein the policy digest
4 is a bit vector of a cached policy.” Claim 23 benefits from arguments presented in
5 support of claim 18.

6 **Independent claim 26** recites the element “generating a policy digest for a
7 cached policy that applies to a client, the policy digest identifying at least one
8 assertion the client is complying with”. Applicant presents arguments presented in
9 support of claim 1, in support of claim 26.

10 Accordingly, Gates fails to disclose or show each recited element of claim
11 26, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102
12 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

13 Dependent claims 28, 29, and 31-33 depend on claim 26, and are allowable
14 at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 26. Accordingly,
15 Applicant respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 28, 29, and 31-33
16 be withdrawn based on the reasons provided in support of claim 26. Furthermore,
17 particular dependent claims are allowable based on additional reasons provided
18 below.

19 Claim 28 further recites “[t]he computer program product of claim 26
20 wherein the computer process further comprises encoding a bit vector of the
21 cached policy.” Claim 23 benefits from arguments presented in support of claim
22 12.

23 Claim 29 further recites “[t]he computer program product of claim 26
24 wherein the computer process further comprises reading an assertion from the
25

1 policy, assigning a bit value to the assertion, and writing the bit value to a bit
2 vector.”

3 Gates does not disclose or show “reading an assertion from the policy,
4 assigning a bit value to the assertion, and writing the bit value to a bit vector” as
5 recited in claim 29. Gates discloses the synchronization of the object that is copied
6 from a remote location to a local space at a client to match the running
7 applications. The required synchronization can be with respect to time, type of
8 request to be executed or the number of requests to be processed. Gates further
9 describes a policy that specifies the conditions for synchronizing the object. The
10 policy can be a default policy or based upon the user action. The rule set of the
11 policy can also be determined by analyzing the requests exchanged between the
12 server and the client. The synchronization of the copy of the object located at the
13 client side with the copy of the object present at the remote location is carried out.
14 This synchronization is performed by transmitting minimal information about any
15 change in the local copy of the object from the client side to a remote system such
16 as server. The function of transmitting the minimal information is managed by the
17 editing context. Consequently, the updates in the copies of the object present at
18 other remote locations are made by the server. The object can also have a private
19 data with access limited to a particular client. Therefore, only the non-confidential
20 information is passed while creating the object for the client having limited or no
21 access to the private data. See Gates, col. 6, lines 36-60, col. 7, lines 50-61.

22 For example, the Application discloses reading an assertion from the policy,
23 assigning a bit value to the assertion, and writing the bit value to a bit vector The
24 bit vector written in XML in the cached policy is encoded with the policy digest.
25 The binary value of the bit vector is encoded as a text value indicating the

1 assertion selected in the policy digest. The bit value 1 indicates selection of a
2 particular assertion and the bit value 0 refers to the non-selection of the particular
3 assertion. However Gates discloses that the object is mutated or transformed into a
4 different kind of object containing only some specific information which is
5 allowed to be accessible by the client. See Gates, col. 7, lines 50-57.

6 Claim 31 further recites “[t]he computer program product of claim 26,
7 wherein the computer process further comprises: incrementing a counter each time
8 the cached policy is used; and removing the cached policy from a cache at the
9 client when the counter exceeds a limit value.”

10 Gates does not disclose or show “incrementing a counter each time the
11 cached policy is used; and removing the cached policy from a cache at the client
12 when the counter exceeds a limit value” as recited in claim 31. Gates discloses the
13 synchronization of the object that is copied from a remote location to a local space
14 at a client to match the running applications. The required synchronization can be
15 with respect to time, type of request to be executed or the number of requests to be
16 processed. Gates describes a policy that specifies the conditions for synchronizing
17 the object. The policy can be a default policy or based upon the user action. The
18 rule set of the policy can also be determined by analyzing the requests exchanged
19 between the server and the client. The synchronization of the copy of the object
20 located at the client side with the copy of the object present at the remote location
21 is carried out. This synchronization is performed by transmitting minimal
22 information about any change in the local copy of the object from the client side to
23 a remote system such as server. The function of transmitting the minimal
24 information is managed by the editing context. Consequently, the updates in the
25

1 copies of the object present at other remote locations are made by the server. See
2 Gates, col. 6, lines 36-60.

3 For example, the Application discloses a counter which is associated with
4 the cached policy. The value of the counter is updated when the cached policy
5 located at the client side is used for comparison with the policy located at the
6 server. When the policy at the client side does not match with the policy that is
7 located at the server, then the value of the counter is incremented. The policy at
8 the client side is also removed, when the value of the counter exceeds a limiting
9 value.

10 Claim 33 further recites “[t]he computer program product of claim 26
11 wherein the computer process further comprises triggering a diagnostic event when
12 a fault is received at the client.”

13 Gates does not disclose or show “triggering a diagnostic event when a fault
14 is received at the client” as recited by claim 33. Gates discloses that the object
15 can be retrieved from the server for creating the required copy of the object at the
16 client side by using certain segments of the object that have not been previously
17 used. The method of object creation is known as faulting. The segments contain
18 reference to other objects at some remote location from which the data is required
19 to be retrieved. For retrieval of objects, the object graph editing context is used
20 that helps in getting only the required data and not the whole of information
21 contained in the referenced object. The editing context at the client is called as
22 object store. The required data included in the referenced object is acquired only
23 when it is absent from the local space at the client. The editing context is also used
24 to manage the local object graph. To access the remote or referenced objects, a
25 object persistent mechanism is used. In this mechanism, an object store sends a

1 request to the server editing context. The server editing context provides for the
2 connection to the external facility such as a relational database or a file system
3 where the object is actually persistent or present. See Gates, col. 9, lines 49-67.

4 For example, the Application discloses triggering a diagnostic event when a
5 fault is received at the client. The fault triggers a diagnostic event at the client
6 which identifies the problem with the system and maintains a log for
7 administrator's review.

8 **Independent claim 34** recites the element “extracting at a host a policy
9 digest identifying a cached policy that applies to a client”. Applicant presents
10 arguments presented in support of claim 1, in support of claim 34.

11 Accordingly, Gates fails to disclose or show each recited element of claim
12 34, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102
13 rejection of claim 34 be withdrawn.

14 Dependent claims 35-37 depend on claim 34, and are allowable at the least
15 by virtue of their dependency on base claim 34. Accordingly, Applicant
16 respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 35-37 be withdrawn based on
17 the reasons provided in support of claim 34. Furthermore, particular dependent
18 claims are allowable based on additional reasons provided below.

19 Claim 36 further recites “[t] computer program product of claim 34 wherein
20 the computer process further comprises decoding a bit vector of the cached
21 policy.” Claim 36 benefits from arguments presented in support of claim 12.

1 **35 U.S.C. §103**

2 Claims 2, 5, 14, 19, 24, 27, 30, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a)
3 as being unpatentable over Gates, as applied to claim 1, 9, 15, 21, 26 and 34, in
4 further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,764 issued to Atkinson et al (Atkinson).

5 **Dependent claims 2 and 5** depend on claim 1, and include all the elements
6 of claim 1. Gates, as discussed above in support of claim 1, fails to teach or
7 suggest the element “generating a policy digest for a cached policy that applies to a
8 client”. Atkinson is cited by the Action as to generating or using a hash of the
9 policy; however, Atkinson is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Gates.

10 Accordingly, Gates in view of Atkinson fails to teach or suggest each
11 recited element of claims 2 and 5, and the rejection is improper. Applicant
12 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 2 and 5 be withdrawn.

13 **Dependent claim 14** depends on claim 9, and includes all the elements of
14 claim 9. Gates, as discussed above in support of claim 9, fails to teach or suggest
15 the element “extracting at a host a policy digest identifying a cached policy that
16 applies to a client, the policy digest included in a request to access a resource”;
17 however, Atkinson is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Gates.

18 Accordingly, Gates in view of Atkinson fails to teach or suggest each
19 recited element of claim 14, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully
20 requests that the §103 rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

21 **Dependent claim 19** depends on claim 15, and includes all the elements of
22 claim 15. Gates, as discussed above in support of claim 15, fails to teach or
23 suggest the element “a policy digest identifying at least one cached policy that
24 applies to a client”; however, Atkinson is of no assistance in light of the teachings
25 of Gates.

1 Accordingly, Gates in view of Atkinson fails to teach or suggest each
2 recited element of claim 19, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully
3 requests that the §103 rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

4 **Dependent claim 24** depends on claim 21, and includes all the elements of
5 claim 21. Gates, as discussed above in support of claim 21, fails to teach or
6 suggest the element “a policy digest for a cached policy that applies to a client, the
7 policy digest identifying at least one assertion the client is complying with”;
8 however, Atkinson is of no assistance in light of the teachings of Gates.

9 Accordingly, Gates in view of Atkinson fails to teach or suggest each
10 recited element of claim 24, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully
11 requests that the §103 rejection of claim 24 be withdrawn.

12 **Dependent claims 27 and 30** depend on claim 26, and include all the
13 elements of claim 26. Gates, as discussed above in support of claim 26, fails to
14 teach or suggest the element “generating a policy digest for a cached policy that
15 applies to a client, the policy digest identifying at least one assertion the client is
16 complying with”. Atkinson is cited by the Action as to generating or using a hash
17 of the policy; however, Atkinson is of no assistance in light of the teachings of
18 Gates.

19 Accordingly, Gates in view of Atkinson fails to teach or suggest each
20 recited element of claims 27 and 30, and the rejection is improper. Applicant
21 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 27 and 30 be withdrawn.

22 **Dependent claim 38** depends on claim 34, and includes all the elements of
23 claim 34. Gates, as discussed above in support of claim 34, fails to teach or
24 suggest the element “extracting at a host a policy digest identifying a cached policy
25

1 that applies to a client”; however, Atkinson is of no assistance in light of the
2 teachings of Gates.

3 Accordingly, Gates in view of Atkinson fails to teach or suggest each
4 recited element of claim 38, and the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully
5 requests that the §103 rejection of claim 38 be withdrawn.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /Emmanuel A. Rivera/
Emmanuel A. Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(512) 344-9931